

1 P. Kristofer Strojnik, SBN 242728  
2 pstrojnik@strojniklaw.com  
3 Esplanade Center III, Suite 700  
4 2415 East Camelback Road  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
6 415-450-0100 (tel.)

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 THERESA BROOKE, a married woman  
11 dealing with her sole and separate claim,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 LHO LE PARC LP, a Delaware limited  
15 partnership,

16 Defendant.

Case No:

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT**

**(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)**

17 Plaintiff alleges:

18 **PARTIES**

19 1. Plaintiff Theresa Brooke is a married woman. Plaintiff is legally disabled,  
20 and is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2),  
21 the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 et seq., the  
22 California Unruh Civil Rights Act. Plaintiff ambulates with the aid of a wheelchair due  
23 to the loss of a leg.

24 2. Defendant, LHO Le Parc LP, owns and/or operates and does business as  
25 the hotel Le Parc at Melrose located at 733 N West Knoll Drive, West Hollywood,  
26 California 90069. Defendant's hotel is a public accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §  
27 12181(7)(A), which offers public lodging services. On information and belief,  
28 Defendant's hotel was built or renovated after March 15, 2012.

**JURISDICTION**

3. Jurisdiction in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.

4. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district and Defendant does substantial business in this judicial district.

5. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred.

6. Pursuant to *Arroyo v. Rosas*, supplemental jurisdiction is appropriate over Plaintiff's Unruh claim. On a case-specific analysis, there are no compelling reasons to decline jurisdiction.

**ALLEGATIONS**

7. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's hotel does not have a compliant access aisle at the passenger loading zone adjacent to the hotel lobby in violation of Sections 209 and 503 of the 2010 Standards. An access aisle has specific requirements to be compliant with the Standards: It must be (1) 60 inches wide and at least 20 feet long, (2) it must have an accessible route adjoining it, and (3) it cannot be within a vehicular way. Section 503.3.

8. The requirement for an access aisle at a passenger loading zone is immensely important for a person in a wheelchair such as Plaintiff, as it provides safe access to the entry of the hotel and deters others from placing encumbrances or obstacles there such as a vehicle parking. An access aisle is akin to a cross-walk for pedestrians. Absence of an access aisle where required creates dangerous conditions for a person in a wheelchair such as Plaintiff.

9. Plaintiff formerly worked in the hospitality industry. She and her husband are avid travelers to California for purposes of leisure travel and to "test" whether various hotels comply with disability access laws. Testing is encouraged by the Ninth Circuit.

1           10. Plaintiff traveled to Los Angeles in late October 2023 for testing ADA  
2 compliance and court appearances. She anticipates lodging at and has concrete plans to  
3 lodge at Defendant's hotel in May 2024, but if she arrives in May, and Defendant has  
4 not remediated, she will not honor the reservation.

5           11. During this trip, Plaintiff personally visited Defendant's hotel.  
6 Defendant's hotel has a passenger loading zone because pickup and dropoff occurs  
7 there and it is located directly outside of the lobby entrance. There are also design  
8 features showing an intent for utilization as a passenger loading zone. For example,  
9 there are signs that state "Passenger Loading Only" and other signs stating "Loading  
10 and Unloading Zone Please Turn Off Engines." According to the U.S. Access Board  
11 Technical Guidelines on Passenger Loading Zones, passenger loading zones are so  
12 common at hotels that even it recognizes "many hotel entrances" have the design  
13 features indicating an intent to utilize as PLZs.

14           12. While at Defendant's hotel, she discovered that Defendant's hotel has a  
15 barrier to entry to the lobby, which is that the passenger loading zone does not have an  
16 access aisle compliant with Section 503.3. It is an absolute requirement to have an  
17 access aisle at a passenger loading zone pursuant to Sections 209 and 503. The  
18 requirement of an access aisle at a passenger loading zone relates to Plaintiff's  
19 disability of not having one leg and being forced to use a wheelchair because access  
20 aisles are required so persons in a wheelchair can maneuver without threat of danger  
21 from other vehicles and without other encumbrances obstructing their pathway. The  
22 lobby, therefore, is inaccessible to Plaintiff by way of the passenger loading zone  
23 because there is no access aisle.

24           13. Additionally, Defendant's hotel provides for valet parking in the  
25 passenger loading zone area. Section 209.4 of the Standards requires a mandatory  
26 access aisle where valet parking services are provided, but Defendant does not provide  
27 for an access aisle as indicated above. Accordingly, Defendant also violates Section  
28 209.4 because it provides for valet but does not provide for an access aisle.

1           14. Plaintiff gained actual and personal knowledge of a barrier while visiting  
2 Defendant's hotel (no access aisle at passenger loading zone), and as a result, she was  
3 deterred from entering the hotel both from the barrier and due to the lack of equality.  
4 She anticipates returning to this hotel and has concrete plans to do so in May 2024 (see  
5 above), but she will only lodge at the hotel if Defendant puts the required access aisle  
6 into place. Visiting otherwise would be futile because the lack of the access aisle  
7 represents a barrier to entering the lobby.

8           15. It is readily achievable and inexpensive to modify the hotel to provide an  
9 access aisle, which involves painting and measuring tools.

10           16. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff and others will continue to be unable to  
11 independently use Defendant's hotel in violation of her rights under the ADA.

12                           **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13           17. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations heretofore set forth.

14           18. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and others in that it has  
15 failed to make its public lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable  
16 by, individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) and §  
17 12182(b)(2)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above.

18           19. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff in that it has failed to  
19 remove architectural barriers to make its lodging services fully accessible to, and  
20 independently usable by individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C.  
21 §12182(b)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above. Compliance with the  
22 2010 Standards would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendant's lodging  
23 services nor result in an undue burden to Defendant.

24           20. In violation of the 2010 Standards, Defendant's hotel passenger loading  
25 zone does not have a disability access aisle compliant with Section 503.3 of the  
26 Standards.  
27  
28

1           21. Compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards,  
2 as described above, is readily achievable by the Defendant. *Id.* Readily achievable  
3 means that providing access is easily accomplishable without significant difficulty or  
4 expense.

5           22. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and Plaintiff invokes her statutory right  
6 to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

7           23. Without the requested injunctive relief, Defendant's non-compliance with  
8 the ADA's requirements that its passenger loading zone be fully accessible to, and  
9 independently useable by, disabled people is likely to recur.

10           WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 11           a. Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant  
12           was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA  
13           described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the ADA;  
14           b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR §  
15           36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its  
16           passenger loading zone into full compliance with the requirements set  
17           forth in the ADA;  
18           c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;  
19           d. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and  
20           appropriate.

21           **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

22           24. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations heretofore set forth.

23           25. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and others in that it has  
24 failed to make its public lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable  
25 by, individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) and §  
26 12182(b)(2)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above.

27           26. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff in that it has failed to  
28 remove architectural barriers to make its lodging services fully accessible to, and  
independently usable by individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C.

1 §12182(b)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above. Compliance with the  
2 2010 Standards would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendant's lodging  
3 services nor result in an undue burden to Defendant.

4 27. In violation of the 2010 Standards, Defendant's hotel valet parking area  
5 does not have a disability access aisle compliant with Section 209.4 of the Standards.

6 28. Compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards,  
7 as described above, is readily achievable by the Defendant. *Id.* Readily achievable  
8 means that providing access is easily accomplishable without significant difficulty or  
9 expense.

10 29. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and Plaintiff invokes her statutory right  
11 to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

12 30. Without the requested injunctive relief, Defendant's non-compliance with  
13 the ADA's requirements that its valet parking area be fully accessible to, and  
14 independently useable by, disabled people is likely to recur.

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 16 a. Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant  
17 was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA  
18 described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the ADA;  
19 b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR §  
20 36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its  
21 valet parking area into full compliance with the requirements set forth in  
22 the ADA;  
23 c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;  
24 d. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and  
25 appropriate.

26 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 31. Plaintiff realleges all allegations heretofore set forth.

28 32. Defendant has violated the Unruh by denying Plaintiff equal access to its  
public accommodation on the basis of her disability as outlined above.



DATED this 1<sup>st</sup> day of November, 2023.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Theresa Marie Brooke', written in a cursive style.

---

Theresa Marie Brooke